

REMARKS

Claims 17, 19, and 21-26, and 28 appear in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration.

No new matter has been added by these amendments and additions.

Claim 28 has been allowed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,653,758 to Solheim.

In rejecting claim 17, the Examiner apparently has not grasped the key patentable concept of the present invention and the reason for the appeal brief being filed. The applicants must respectively take issue with the Examiner's misinterpretation of "dimples on one side of the parting line **interdigitate** with the dimples on the other side" as it appears in claim 1. There is no prior art that teaches this, and Solheim certainly does not. Solheim does not show, in any figure, a dimple that interdigitates with dimples on the other side of the parting line. Please note Figures 8, 10 and 12 of the present invention. Edges of dimples on one side of the parting line actually nestle or mesh (interdigitate) into dimple edges on the other side of the parting line. Note how the top edge of dimples on the lower side of the parting line interdigitate or nestle into the lower edges of dimples on the upper side of the parting line. The prior art does not teach this. The Solheim patent does have dimples on both sides of the equator since his parting line extends above and below the equator of the ball. But, there never is a dimple on one side of his parting line that interdigitates with dimples on the other side of the parting line.

For claims to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) each and every element as set forth in the claims of the present invention must be found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. Applicants respectively submit that Solheim does not disclose a golf ball having dimples on one side of the parting line interdigitating with dimples on the other side of the parting line.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solheim '758 and Sanchez U.S. Pat. No. 5,249,804.

Sanchez discloses a parting line quite similar to the Solheim patent. However, as the Sanchez patent is viewed it only reinforces what the inventive concept of the present invention seeks to fix, and that is the large amount of surface space wasted on the Sanchez golf ball, i.e. space that is void of dimples. This is a critical golf ball flaw as discussed in the Applicants' specification on page 3, lines 4-17. The reason Solheim and Sanchez have such large surface areas void of dimples is because their golf balls both have parting lines that are based only on a single wavelength that encircles the ball. The present teaches an entirely new concept.

The Examiner stated that claims 21-23 define a method of making a product but does not affect the final product. The Applicants must emphatically, but respectfully disagree. The golf ball claimed in claims 21-23 is a golf ball that has a parting line that can only be created by the superposition of a base waveform (similar to the Solheim or Sanchez parting lines) with a shorter secondary waveform, which is a function of the individual dimple pattern. Thus the resultant parting line of the Applicants' ball follows the individual dimple pattern and is not just the result of one single waveform around the ball, as is Sojheim and Sanchez. The superior dimple coverage is very apparent. One need only to look at the Applicants' figures 8, 10, and 12 and compare them to the figures shown in Solheim and Sanchez and the inherent wasted surface space. One skilled in the art knows that the greater the percentage of the golf ball surface that is covered by dimples, the better the golf ball. The Applicant's golf ball has a unique dimple coverage.

Neither Solheim nor Sanchez addresses the inventive concept which is a golf ball having a parting line that can only be made by the implementation of a shorter waveform (based on the dimple pattern) superimposed on a larger base waveform to

create the golf ball parting line which allows dimples on both sides of the parting line to interdigitate with dimples on the other side.

Accordingly, claims 19, and 21-23 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected as unpatentable over Solheim in view of Sajima (2002/0019274). These claims have been acknowledged as only being patentable to the extent that they further define an independent claim that is allowable.

Conclusion

Based on the remarks set forth above, Applicants believe that all of the rejections have been overcome and the claims of the subject application are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any further concerns or believe that a discussion with the Applicants' agent would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the agent at the number below.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. However, should any required fees be due, please charge them to Acushnet Company Deposit Account No. 502309.

May 29, 2008
Date

Respectfully submitted,



D. Michael Burns (Reg. No. 38,400)
508-979-3563

Customer Number: 40990